

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks which follow.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 2-26 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-14, 23, and 25 have been amended. Claims 18-22 and 24 have been allowed.

Objections

Claims 5 and 6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 6 depends from claim 5. Accordingly, claims 5 and 6 are now in allowable form. Withdrawal of objections to claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowability of claims 5 and 6.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 7-17, 23, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Maeda et al. (JP 09249430). Claim 1 has been cancelled. Accordingly, rejection of claim 1 is moot. Reconsideration of rejection of claims 2-4, 7-17, 23, 25, and 26 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 7-13 have been amended to depend from claim 5, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Accordingly, claims 2-4 and 7-13 are now in allowable form. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 and 7-13 is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 23, and 25 have been amended to include the limitation that the glass composition or glass sheet or glass substrate recited in the claims exhibits a linear coefficient of thermal expansion of $80 \text{ to } 95 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ over a temperature range of 25 to 300°C. Maeda et al. do not disclose a glass composition, sheet, or substrate exhibiting a linear coefficient of thermal expansion of $80 \text{ to } 95 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ over a temperature range of 25 to 300°C. Accordingly, claims

14, 23, and 25, as amended, are patentable over Maeda et al. Withdrawal of rejection of claims 14, 23, and 25 is respectfully requested. Claims 15-17 and 26 being dependent on claims 14 and 25, respectively, are also patentable over Maeda et al.

Conclusion

The rejected claims have been amended and/or shown to be allowable over the prior art. Applicant believes that this paper is fully responsive to each and every ground of rejection cited by the Examiner in the Office Action dated December 1, 2003, and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any refunds, to Deposit Account 03-3325 (ref. SP01-284).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/31/2003

Adenike Adewuya
Adenike A. Adewuya
Reg. No. 42,254
Tel.: (281) 477-3450

BEST AVAILABLE COPY